

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This supplemental amendment is filed in response to the Notice of Non-compliant amendment and responds to the Office Action dated May 31, 2007, in which the Examiner rejected claims 6-7 and 34-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejected claims 6 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, rejected claims 1, 6-14, 16-19, 21-29, 31-35 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and objected to claims 20 and 30 as being dependent upon a rejected based claim but would be allowable of rewritten in independent form.

In the Notice of Non-Compliant amendment, the Examiner stated that the “system” in claim 1 lacked hardware. However, the hardware in claim 1 includes the project-making device and the processing device. Therefore, Applicants have claimed a system. Furthermore, although the Examiner stated that the “computer-readable medium” lacks hardware, Applicants’ claim 6 is for a computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program causing a computer to carry out a process comprising the steps of.... In other words, claim 6 is directed to a computer program method having steps. Thus, no hardware is claimed. Applicants also respectfully bring the Examiner’s attention to U.S. Patent No. 7,337,458 which also claims “a computer-readable medium including computer program instructions that cause a computer to implement a method of content recommendation, comprising:”. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants claim 6 is similar in form to the claim in U.S. Patent No. 7,337,458 and thus is not defective.

As indicated above, claim 6 and 7 have been amended to recite essential cooperative relationships. Additionally, Applicants respectfully point out that claims 34 and 35 already recite the relationships pointed out by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner approves the correction and withdraws the rejection to claims 6-7 and 34-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

As indicated above, claims 6 and 34 have been amended to be directed to statutory subject matter. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claim 6 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

As indicated above, objected to claim 20 has been incorporated, along with claim 18, into claims 1, 6-8 and 34-35. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 1, 6-14, 16-19, 21-29, 31-35 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the objection to claim 30 since it now depends from an allowable claim.

Thus, it now appears that the application is in condition for a reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner find that the application is not now in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner enters this amendment for purposes of appeal.

**CONCLUSION**

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 05-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

Frommer Lawrence & Haug LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

Date: March 3, 2008

By: 

Ellen Marche Ermas  
Reg. No. 32,131  
(202) 292-1530